DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 221 PS 017 822

AUTHOR Rose, Terry L.
TITLE Corporal Punishment in American Public Schools: Five Years Later.
SPONS AGENCY North Carolina Univ., Charlotte.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 62p.; Document contains light print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Corporal Punishment; Demography; *Discipline; Discipline Policy; Educational Practices; Elementary Secondary Education; Junior High Schools; National Surveys; *Public Schools; *Research Needs; School Administration
IDENTIFIERS Research Replication

ABSTRACT

This investigation, which replicates a previous descriptive study, describes the uses of corporal punishment with students in American public schools. A school discipline survey was mailed to 371 elementary, junior high, and high school principals in 18 randomly selected states representing the nine U.S. Census regions; usable information was returned by 261 school principals for a response rate of 70.4%. Approximately twice as many elementary schools as junior high or high schools were selected. Results indicated widespread use of corporal punishment with students at every grade level in virtually all regions of the United States. Descriptions of the uses of corporal punishment across demographic and administrative/procedural variables are discussed. Comparisons of current to previous findings are made and trends noted. In addition, implications for instruction and directions for further research are discussed. Approximately 60 references are cited. Although no position regarding the appropriateness of corporal punishment is taken in this paper, it is maintained that the widespread use of corporal punishment should concern educators and researchers. The source of this concern continues to be the unsubstantiated effects of its use, rather than its use per se. There continues to be virtually no empirical evidence that either supports or refutes the use of corporal punishment with students in schools. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED304221

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Corporal Punishment in American Public Schools: Five Years Later

Terry L. Rose, Ph.D.

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Terry L. Rose

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Running Head: Corporal Punishment

PS 018822

Preparation of this manuscript was supported in part by a research grant awarded by the University of North Carolina at Charlotte Foundation. Address all correspondence to Dr. Terry L. Rose, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, NC 28223.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

In a replication of a previous descriptive study, the uses of corporal punishment with students in American public schools are described. A school discipline survey was mailed to 371 principals in 18 randomly selected states representing the nine U.S. Census regions. Results indicated widespread use of corporal punishment with students at every grade level in virtually all regions of the United States. Descriptions of the uses of corporal punishment across demographic and administrative/procedural variables are provided and discussed. Comparisons of current findings to previous findings are made and trends noted and discussed. Further research directions and instructional implications are also discussed.

Corporal Punishment in American Public Schools: Five Years Later

Corporal punishment by school personnel as a disciplinary procedure has occurred throughout the history of American public education (Bolmeier, 1976; Freeman, 1966; Manning, 1979; Maurer, 1974; Williams, 1973). Alternately throughout our history, corporal punishment has been advocated or condemned and has been the cause of numerous controversies based on the ethics, morality, legality, and efficacy of its use (Elrod, 1983; Hess, 1985; Maurer, 1982; Owens & Straus, 1973; Raichle, 1977-78; Reinholz, 1979; Reitman, 1979; Skinner, 1979; Van Dyke, 1984). Recently, several events have kept corporal punishment at the center of educational controversy. First, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in Ingraham v. Wright (1977) that corporal punishment does not violate constitutional safeguards against cruel and unusual punishment. Second, the recent call for a "return to basics" in educational and disciplinary practices has been seen by many as an endorsement of corporal punishment (Welsh, 1978). Third, the growing conservative political influence of fundamentalist religious groups has fostered debate and influenced legislation regarding the use of corporal punishment in private schools, especially nursery schools (Maurer, 1982). As an aside, these events have occurred even though a consensus regarding the definition of corporal punishment is lacking. A commonly accepted definition includes at least the

contingent paddling or spanking of a student on the buttocks (Cooper, Heron, & Heward, 1987).

Proponents of corporal punishment suggest that it may provide rapid reduction or elimination of misbehavior, facilitates discrimination learning, teaches respect for rules and authority, vicariously deters similar misbehavior by peers, and builds character (Dubanoski, Inaba, & Gerkewicz, 1983; Killory, 1974; Mercurio, 1972; Reinholz, 1979).

Numerous arguments against the use of corporal punishment have been presented, including the following undesirable effects: (a) children may avoid or withdraw from the punishing situation whenever possible (Azrin, Hake, Holz, & Hutchinson, 1965; Bongiovanni & Hyman, 1978); (b) children may imitate adults' acts of punishment (Bandura, 1965); (c) children may attend to the punished behavior, which then may be emitted by other students when the teacher is not present (Bandura, 1965); (d) subsequent ajudication and delinquency (e.g., Agnew, 1983); (e) damage to self-concept and subsequent social interactions (e.g., Bryan & Freed, 1982); (f) absence of generalization of behavior improvement to different settings (Birnbrauer, 1968; Bongiovanni, 1979; Johnston, 1972; Risley, 1968); and (g) an increase in children's aggressive reactions, including both operant aggression (i.e., attacks against the source of the punishment) (Delgado, 1963) and elicited aggression (i.e., attacks directed toward other people or property in the environment) (Azrin, et al, 1965; Azrin, Hutchinson, & Sallery, 1964; Ulrich & Azrin, 1962).

Regardless of one's position on the issue of using corporal punishment in the schools, most professional and public opinion continues to be shaped more by folklore and conjecture than by empririical evidence. While some forms of physical punishment have been investigated, such as slaps (Birnbrauer, 1968; Koegel & Covert, 1972; Koegel, Firestone, Kramme, & Dunlap, 1974; Lovaas, Berberich, Perloff, & Schaeffer, 1966; Romanczyk, 1977), these interventions were used with severe behavioral disturbances, such as self-stimulation and self-injurious behaviors. But, there appear to be no applied empirical studies that support the use of corporal punishment. (Evidence of this lack of data-based support may be found in Matson and DiLorenzo's [1984] thorough review of punishment, in which only one reference regarding corporal punishment, a discussion article, was cited.) Rather, supportive evidence comes from clinical practice (Killory, 1974; Leviton, 1976) or anecdotal field studies (Mercurio, 1972). Other published reviews indicate that the effects of physical punishment in applied settings are still largely unknown (Bongiovanni, 1979; Gardner, 1969; Johnston, 1972; Solomon, 1964; Walters & Grusec, 1977). Despite the absence of research support, corporal punishment continues to be used in the majority of public schools (Department of Education Office of Civil Rights, 1982; Elrod, 1983; Hess, 1985; Hyman, 1976; Kinnard & Rust, 1981; Rose, 1984; Rust & Kinnard, 1983) [1].

Not only is little known about the effects of corporal punishment, but we lack descriptive information regarding its use in public schools. Kinnard and Rust (1981) found that 100% of the responding school districts in Tennessee reported allowing corporal

punishment and Elrod (1983) found that 58% of Indiana school principals reported using corporal punishment. Rose (1984) reported that 74% of the principals in a national sample used corporal punishment and, in a related study, found that 69% of all principals in a national sample who used corporal punishment also used it with mildly handicapped students in their schools. No other descriptive studies were found by the author that add to our knowledge of the use of corporal punishment in American public schools.

The purpose of the present study was to describe the current uses of corporal punishment with public school students by replicating Rose's previous study (1984). A second purpose was to identify and describe any trends in the use of corporal punishment that may have developed during the five years since the original study.

Method

Selection of Respondents

The sample for the current study was selected in an attempt to replicate as closely as possible the sample from an earlier related study of school disciplinary practices with handicapped learners (Rose, 1984). The original sample selection procedure involved: (a) selecting randomly two states from each of the nine U.S. Census districts, (b) selecting randomly a total of 10 school districts from each of the 18 selected states, (c) mailing letters to those school superintendents, explaining the study and requesting a list of the principals in their district, and (d) selecting randomly

principals from responding districts to receive the school discipline survey (cf. Rose, 1984). The same schools were selected for the current study plus an additional 17 schools whose districts did not respond in time to be included in the previous study. Thus, 371 schools were selected from 18 preselected states. The schools were controlled for grade level by selecting schools using the following approximate ratio: Elementary 2: Junior High 1: High School 1. No attempts to control other demographic variables (e.g., size of community, number of students, and sex of principal) were made. Special schools (e.g., special education centers or vocational/technical schools) were excluded.

Each principal received a letter explaining the rationale of the study, the voluntary nature of their participation, the use of group data, and an offer to share results along with the school discipline survey form. No follow-up was performed, due to the impending end of the school year. Usable information was returned by 261 school principals (70.4%). Those who declined to participate or provided incomplete information were classified as nonusable responses. Quantitative descriptions of the pool of respondents may be found in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Questionnaire

The school discipline survey asked for information about the respondents demography and their uses of corporal punishment with handicapped learners. It was designed to obtain a maximum of descriptive information with as little effort by the respondents as possible. Twenty-three of the 25 questions germane to this report were answered by selecting from two or more choices or required a yes-no response. The remaining items asked for information that could not be predicted (i.e., which behaviors resulted in corporal punishment and the number of years each respondent had been a principal).

Results

Data obtained from the school discipline survey may be analyzed most easily when subdivided into four categories: (a) general results, (b) demographic results, (c) administrative/procedural, and (d) administrative opinion.

General Results

Data related to the proportion of principals who use corporal punishment were compiled. Table 2 presents a frequency distribution of responses to each item on the questionnaire. As may be seen in Table 2, 58.1% of the total number of principals responding indicated that they used corporal punishment with their students.

Insert Table 2 about here

Demographic Results

Demographic results include descriptions of the differential uses of corporal punishment when analyzed by personal, geographic, or school-related variables. These demographic findings are discussed below.

Principal's Sex. No significant differences were found when data regarding the relationship betweeen the principal's sex and the use of corporal punishment were analyzed using the chi-square procedure, as 65.2% of the female and 56.3% of the male principals reported using corporal punishment. A significant relationship existed between a principal's sex and the use of corporal punishment: higher frequencies of corporal punishment were reported by male principals exclusively. No female principal reported using corporal punishment with more than 10 students per month, whereas 20.9% of the male principals reported using corporal punishment with more than 10 students per month. On the other hand, however, males were most likely to not use corporal punishment: 21.8% reported not using corporal punishment during the preceding 30 days. (It should be noted that 81.9% of the respondents were male. [2])

Principal's experience. Significant differences were found when data were analyzed controlling for the number of year's each

respondent had been a school principal: $\chi^2(6, n=253)=13.3$, $p=.04$. Principals in their first year and those with 21-25 years experience were more likely to use corporal punishment, while those with 11-15 years and more than 25 years experience were less likely.

Community size. Significant differences were found when the use of corporal punishment was analyzed using community size as the independent variable: $\chi^2(7, n=258)=35.75$, $p<.001$. There appears to be an inverse relationship between the size of the community in which the respondent's school is located and the use of corporal punishment. Thus, principals of schools in smaller communities reported a disproportionately high use of corporal punishment, whereas relatively fewer principals of schools in larger communities reported using corporal punishment. The reader is referred to Table 3 for a quantitative description of the responses to this item.

Insert Table 3 about here

Region. The nine U.S. Census districts and the number of affirmative and negative responses obtained within each region are reported in Table 3. Significant differences were found among the regions: $\chi^2(8, n=260)=96.41$, $p<.0001$.

Number of students enrolled. When the use of corporal punishment was analyzed by the number of students enrolled, differential uses were found: $\chi^2(4, n=260)=20.48$, $p<.001$. As may be seen in Table 3, principals of the largest schools (more than 1,200 enrollment) were least likely to use corporal punishment, whereas those principals of schools with 600-900 students were most likely.

Grade-level of schools. Grade levels were categorized to reflect the various administrative arrangements. For analytic purposes, several categories were combined post hoc so that the resulting grade-level categories were as mutually exclusive as possible. The following grade-level categories were used: elementary includes kindergarten through grades 3,5, and 6; junior high includes grades 6-8, 7-8, and 7-9; and high school includes grades 9-12 and 10-12. Other grade-level arrangements (e.g., kindergarten to grade 8) were excluded from these and subsequent analyses. The reader may find a quantitative description of the responses to this item in Table 3.

Significant differences were found when these data were analyzed: $\chi^2(2, n=246)=36.72$, $p=<.0001$. It appears that, in general, the use of corporal punishment declines as the grade level increases, although principals of junior high schools were the most likely to use corporal punishment.

Student's sex. Clear and consistent differences in the use of corporal punishment among male and female students were found. As may be seen in Table 2, 82.2% of the respondents who use corporal

punishment reported its use with male students in the 30 days preceding their response, whereas only 40.9% reported its actual use with female students. The reader can also see in Table 2 that 93.4% of the respondents reported using corporal punishment with 5 or fewer female students per month, whereas only 71.9% reported using corporal punishment at this frequency with male students. Further, it may be seen that although no principal reported using corporal punishment with more than 10 female students per month, 12.6% reported using corporal punishment at this frequency with male students.

Differential uses of corporal punishment when controlling for the principal's sex may be noted in Table 4. Of the respondents identifiable by sex, 93.1% of the male principals and 100% of the female principals reported using corporal punishment with 5 or fewer female students per month. Only 73.2% of the male principals and 68.2% of the female principals reported using corporal punishment with male students at this frequency. Statistically significant differences were noted for male students, $\chi^2(2, n=134)=12.28$, $p=.03$, but not for female students.

Significant differences were found when the male students' data were analyzed by the number of students enrolled, $\chi^2(3, n=135)=36.15$, $p=.008$, but not for females.

Statistically significant differences were found when the reported frequency of punishment by student's sex were analyzed controlling for region. Male students were significantly more likely to receive corporal punishment more often in the South

Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central regions and less likely in the Middle Atlantic and Mountain regions: χ^2(35, n=135)=98.30, p<.0001. Female students were most likely to receive corporal punishment at higher frequencies in the East South Central region, χ^2(14, n=137)=73.65, p<.0001, while no principal in the Middle Atlantic, West North Central, Mountain, and Pacific regions reported using corporal punishment with female students.

The size of the community in which the respondent's school is located was related to differential uses of corporal punishment with male students, χ^2(30, n=133)=98.70, p=<.0001: principals of schools in the smallest (rural) and largest (more than 500,000) communities were more likely to use corporal punishment at higher frequencies with male students. No differences were found for female students.

Significant differences were found when these data were analyzed by grade-level. Principals of high schools were less likely to use corporal punishment with male students, but when they did, they punished more males per month than principals of schools at other grade-levels: χ^2(8, n=122)=27.00, p=<.001. Female students receive corporal punishment less often as the grade-level increases: χ^2(4, n=124)=9.40, p=.05.

Minority students. Of the respondents who had black students enrolled in their schools and who used corporal punishment (n=134), 51.5% reported using corporal punishment with their black students within the preceding 30 days. When controlling for the principal's sex, significant differences were found, χ^2(4,n=133)=13.74,

p=.008), in the relative frequencies of corporal punishment of black students, with male principals reporting relatively higher frequencies.

Significant regional differences were found: χ^2(28, n=134)=95.47, p=<.0001. Principals in the South Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central regions were the only ones to report using corporal punishment with more than 10 black students in the preceding month.

The size of the community in which the respondent's school is located was related to differential uses of corporal punishment with black students, χ^2(24, n=132)=88.39, p=<.0001: principals of schools in the smallest (rural) and largest (more than 500,000) communities were more likely to use corporal punishment at higher frequencies with black students.

The size of the respondent's school was found to be related to differences in the frequency of their use of corporal punishment with black students: χ^2(12, n=134)=26.01, p=.01. Principals of schools with 600-900 students were the only ones to report using corporal punishment with more than 25 black students during the preceding 30 days.

Significant differences were found when these data were analyzed by grade-level: χ^2(6, n=121)=13.97, p=.03. Principals of elementary and junior high schools were more likely to use corporal punishment with black students more often than principals of high schools.

Administrative/Procedural Results

Several questions were asked regarding the administrative or procedural arrangements surrounding the use of corporal punishment.

Delivery of corporal punishment. Data regarding who administers corporal punishment, who serves as witnesses, and where corporal punishment is delivered are presented below.

Personnel who administer corporal punishment fall into two categories. As may be seen in Table 2, the teacher who refers the student for punishment also adminsters corporal punishment in 23.3% of the schools. Administrative personnel, including principals (58%) and other administrative personnel (13.3%), such as assistant principals, are also primarily responsible for delivering corporal punishment. When these data were analyzed by region, significant differences were obtained, $\chi^2(28, n=150)=51.84$, $p=.004$, with the referring teacher being permitted to administer corporal punishment only in the East North Central, South Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central regions. The principal's sex was related to differences in who was permitted to administer corporal punishment, $\chi^2(4, n=149)=9.78$, $p=.04$. Female principals were more likely to allow others to deliver corporal punishment. The number of years each respondent had been a principal was related significantly to differences in who was allowed to administer corporal punishment: $\chi^2(24, n=148)=40.31$, $p=.02$. Principals with the most experience (more than 25 years) were less likely to allow the referring teacher to deliver corporal punishment. Principals with 15-20 years of experience were more likely to allow instructional

personnel, including both the referring teacher and other teachers, to deliver corporal punishment and were less likely to assume that responsibility themselves. First year principals, those with 5-10 years and those with more than 25 years experience were most likely to administer corporal punishment themselves. Differences were found when these data were analyzed by the size of the respondent's community, $\chi^2(28, n=148)=55.89$, $p=.001$, with the referring teacher being allowed to deliver corporal punishment in all but the largest communities. The size of the respondent's school was also related to who delivers corporal punishment, $\chi^2(16, n=150)=53.69$, $p=<.0001$. Principals of the largest schools were least likely to allow referring teachers to administer corporal punishment and were also least likely to deliver corporal punishment themselves. Significant differences were noted when these data were analyzed using grade-level as the independent variable, $\chi^2(8, n=136)=51.99$, $p=<.0001$. The referring teacher was less likely to be allowed to deliver corporal punishment in high schools; other administrative personnel were most likely to have this responsibility in high schools.

An overwhelming majority of the principals who use corporal punishment require that a witness be present. As may be seen in Table 2, 97.3% of the respondents require a witness.

As may be seen in Table 2, corporal punishment usually occurs in the principal's office (71.9%) or in other administrative areas, such as the assistant principal's or counselor's office (11.6%). Significant differences were found when these data were analyzed

using region as the independent variable, χ^2(28, n=146)=68.54, p=<.0001, with corporal punishment delivered in hallways being allowed in only the Middle Atlantic, South Atlantic, and East South Central regions, while corporal punishment in the classroom where the misbehavior occurred being allowed on in the South Atlantic region. The size of the respondent's community was related to differences in the location of corporal punishment, χ^2(28, n=144)=87.31, p<.0001. Corporal punishment in public, such as hallways, was more likely to occur in rural schools and in schools in communities of 50,000-100,000 population. The size of the respondent's school was related to differences in the location, as well: χ^2(16, n=146)=50.03, p=<.0001. Principals of the largest schools were least likely to allow corporal punishment in either hallways or in their own office, but were most likely to expect corporal punishment to occur in other administrative areas. The grade-level of the school was also found to be related to differences in where corporal punishment occurs: χ^2(8, n=132)=34.87, p=<.0001. Hallways were least likely to be used in high schools, while the principal's and the classroom where the misbehavior occurred were more likely to be acceptable locations in elementary schools. The principal's sex was related to differences in the locations for corporal punishment, χ^2(4, n=145)=14.17, p=.007. Male principals were the only ones to allow corporal punishment to be delivered in public, including hallways and the classroom where the misbehavior occurred.

Delay. The amount of time that typically elapses between the occurrence of the student's misbehavior and the delivery of corporal punishment was estimated by each principal. As may be seen in Table 2, only 19.3% of the respondents reported delays of less than 5 minutes, whereas delays of more than 15 minutes were routine for 36% of the respondents.

Significant differences were found when the estimates of delay were analyzed by the principal's sex, $\chi^2(5, n=149)=16.65$, $p=.005$. Male principals were more likely to report shorter delays than were female principals.

The respondent's experience as a principal was related to differences in the amount of delay reported as typical: $\chi^2(30, n=148)=96.94$, $p=<.0001$. First year principals were more likely to report the longest delays (more than 25 minutes). Principals with 10-20 years experience and those with more than 25 years experience were more likely to report relatively short delays (5-10 minutes). Principals with 5-10 years experience and those with 20-25 years experience were more likely to report relatively longer delays (10-20 minutes).

Regional differences were noted when analyzing the delay data, $\chi^2(35, n=150)=128.62$, $p=<.0001$. Principals in the East North Central and East South Central were most likely to report delays of one minute. No principal in the Middle Atlantic region reported delays of less than 20 minutes. Principals in the South Atlantic and Pacific regions were most likely to report delays of more than 25 minutes.

The size of the community in which the respondent's school was located was related to differences in the delay between misbehavior and corporal punishment, χ^2(35, n=148)=91.93, p=<.0001. Principals of schools in the smallest communities were the only ones to report delays of one minute as being typical. In general, as the size of the community increased, so did the amount of delay.

The size of the respondent's school was related to differences in delay: χ^2(20, n=150)=51.09, p=.0002. Principals of the smallest schools (under 300 enrolled) were more likely to report delays under 5 minutes, as were principals of large schools (900-1,200 enrolled). But, principals of large schools (900-1,200 enrolled) were also most likely to report delays of 15-20 minutes. The largest schools (more than 1,200 students) were those associated with the longest delays (more than 25 minutes).

Behaviors. Several classes of behavior were identified by the principals as those most often resulting in corporal punishment. Each principal was asked to list a specific behavior that most often leads to corporal punishment in his or her school. These responses were categorized for analysis purposes. As may be seen in Table 2, fighting was the response class identified most by principals as leading to corporal punishment. The miscellaneous category is composed of several behavior descriptors, including profanity, spitting, lying, smoking, horseplay, immaturity, and leaving school property.

The amount of the respondents' experience was related to the behaviors identified as leading to corporal punishment: χ^2(54,

n=142, =123.00, p=<.0001. Principals with the least experience (5 years or less) and the most experience (more than 20 years) were more likely to identify fighting as the behavior that most often elicits corporal punishment. In addition, first year principals and those with more than 25 years experience reported punishing the fewest number of response classes with corporal punishment.

Significant differences were found when these data were analyzed controlling for region: χ^2(70, n=144)=162.93, p=<.0001. Fighting is more likely to be punished by principals in the East North Central, West North Central, West South Central, and Mountain regions. Disruptive behavior is more likely to result in corporal punishment in schools in the East South Central region. Repeated violations will more likely elicit corporal punishment in the West North Central, South Atlantic, and Pacific regions.

The size of the community in which the respondent's school is located was related to significant differences in the behaviors identified: χ^2(70, n=142)=177.44, p=<.0001. Disobedience was most likely to receive corporal punishment in the smallest communities. Disruptive behavior and cutting class/truancy were more likely to earn corporal punishment in the largest communities. Principals of schools located in medium-sized communities (5,000-50,000 pop.) were more likely to use corporal punishment as a consequence for fighting.

The size of the respondent's school was related to the behaviors that elicit corporal punishment: χ^2(40, n=144)=162.93, p=<.0001. It appears that principals of small and medium-sized

school are more likely to use corporal punishment as a consequence for disobedience, disrepsect, and fighting. Principals of large schools appear more likely to use corporal punishment to punish disruptive behaviors, truancy, and other miscellaneous behaviors.

Grade-level was related to differences in indentified behaviors: $\chi^2(8, n=133)=74.60$, $p=<.0001$. Fighting and disobedience were identified most often by elementary school principals. Disprespect was identified most often by junior high school principals. High school principals identified disruptive behaviors and cutting class/truancy as those that will most often result in corporal punishment. Furthermore, as the grade-level of the school increased, the number of response classes that elicit corporal punshing generally decreases: elementary school principals identified nine response classes that earned corporal punishment, junior high principals identified nine, and high school principals identified four.

Types of corporal punishment. As may be seen in Table 2, only two types of corporal punishemtn were identified. Every respondent identified spanking as their chosen method of administering corporal punishment, with 98% using a paddle and 2% using their hand.

Administrative Opinion

Four questions were asked regarding principals' opinions of the effectiveness of corporal punishment on several variables, including (a) the general discipline level in their schools, (b) the reductive effects of specific student behaviors, (c) the

maintenance of teacher morale, and (d) the demonstration of their support of their teachers. Table 2 lists the principals' responses to these four questions. As may be seen in Table 2, a substantial majority of the principals responded affirmatively to each of these questions.

When asked whether they perceived corporal punishment to be effective in maintaining the general discipline level in their schools, 59.1% responded that they did. Regional differences were obtained: $\chi^2(7, n=164)=40.27$, $p=<.0001$. Principals in the South Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central regions were more likely to respond affirmatively to this question; those in the Middle Atlantic and Mountain regions were least likely. Female principals were less likely to attribute this benefit to corporal punishment: $\chi^2(1, n=163)=18.69$, $p=<.0001$. The size of the respondent's community was also related to significant differences in the responses to this item: $\chi^2(7, n=162)=18.58$, $p=.01$. Principals of schools in rural communities and in the largest communities (over 500,000 pop.) were more likely to agree with this statement, while those in medium-sized (10,000-50,000 pop) and large (100,000-500,000) communities were less likely.

When principals were asked whether they thought corporal punishment reduced specific behaviors, 73.9% responded affirmatively. Regional differences were noted: $\chi^2(7, n=165)=27.76$, $p=.0002$. Principals in the West North Central, East South Central, and West South Central regions were more likely to respond that corporal punishment was effective for reducing problem

were least likely to attribute this benefit to corporal punishment. In general, as the grade-level of the respondent's school increased, the less likely they were to think that corporal punishment was effective for reducing behavior: $\chi^2(2, n=151)=13.66$, $p=.001$.

As may be seen in Table 2, 61.3% of the principals felt that the use of corporal punishment had a positive effect on teacher morale. Female principals were significantly less likely to agree with this statement: $\chi^2(1, n=150)=18.89$, $p=<.0001$. Regional differences were noted: $\chi^2(7, n=150)=38.26$, $p=<.0001$. Principals in the West North Central, East South Central, and West South Central regions were more likely to respond that corporal punishment had a positive effect on teacher morale. Principals in the Middle Atlantic and Mountain regions were least likely to attribute this benefit to corporal punishment. The size of the respondent's school was related to differential responses to this item, $\chi^2(4, n=150)=10.77$, $p=.03$, with principals of the smallest (fewer than 300 students) and largest (more than 1,200 students) less likely to agree that corporal punishment helped teacher morale. Principals of elementary and junior high schools were significantly more likely to agree with this statement: $\chi^2(2, n=136)=5.99$, $p=.05$.

Corporal punishment was viewed as an effective way to demonstrate support of their teachers by 62.2% of the respondents. Female principals were significantly less likely to agree with this

statement. χ^2 [illegible] principal's experience increased, so did their support for this benefit of corporal punishment: $\chi^2(6, n=145)=13.70$, $p=.03$. Regional differences were obtained: $\chi^2(7, n=148)=36.15$, $p=<.0001$. Principals in the West North Central, East South Central, and West South Central regions were more likely to respond affirmatively, while principals in the Middle Atlantic, East North Central, and Mountain regions were less likely. The size of the respondent's community was differentially related to responses to this item: $\chi^2(7, n=146)=22.41$, $p=.002$. Principals of schools in relatively small communities (5,000-10,000 pop) were more likely to agree with this statement, while those in moderate-sized (50,000-100,000 pop) and the largest (over 500,000 pop) communities were less likely. The size of the respondent's school was also related to significant differences in the responses to this item: $\chi^2(4, n=148)=19.31$, $p=.0007$. Principals of the largest schools (more than 900 students) were less likely to have responded affirmatively to this item. In general, as the grade-level of the respondent's school increased, the level of their support for this item decreased: $\chi^2(2, n=134)=18.94$, $p=.0001$.

Discussion

Even though the major purpose of the current study was descriptive rather than analytic, several general, demographic, and administrative variable were identified that appear to be related to differential uses of corporal punishment with public school students. Corporal punishment occurs in most regions of the

country, in communities of every size, at every grade-level, and is administered by principals of either sex with a wide range of experience as a principal, and is applied differentially depending on the student's sex and, perhaps, race (cf. Glackman, Martin, Hyman, McDowell, Berv, & Spino, 1978). Furthermore, non-instructional staff appear most likely to deliver corporal punishment in administrative rather than instructional areas. Instructional staff are most likely to serve as witnesses. These findings imply requirements that corporal punishment be delivered in relative privacy by someone who is not angry at the time. Finally, a wide range of behaviors were reported to be consequated with corporal punishment. Many of the behaviors were broadly described, such as "disrespect for teacher", "inappropriate classroom behavior", "back talk", "refusal to work", "misbehavior", and "immaturity". Other descriptions, however, were more precise and definitive, such as "fighting", "injuring others", "leaving school grounds", or "smoking". Violent behaviors, either against person or property, appear to be those that most often result in corporal punishment.

In addition to describing the current uses and practices surrounding the use of corporal punishment with American public school students, the current study was an attempt to replicate a previous study (cf. Rose, 1984) and subsequently compare current findings to previous findings to determine any trends in these uses and practices over a five-year period. Response percentages for selected items from the previous study were divided into those from

the current study [illegible] relevant response percentages and resulting trends are presented in Table 5.

Insert Table 5 about here

An decrease of 25.6% (58.1% currently as compared to 74.1% responding affirmatively five years ago) in the past five years in the number of principals reported using corporal punishment may be seen in Table 5. Decreases in the reported use of corporal punishment occurred across community sizes (although rural communities reported the smallest decrease) and principal's sex. Principals in most regions reported decreased use, although more principals reported using corporal punishment in the Middle Atlantic and South Atlantic regions, while the percentage stayed the same in the New England and West South Central regions. Medium-sized schools reported a slight increase in the use of corporal punishment, whereas schools of every other size reported reductions. More junior high school principals reported using corporal punishment than five years ago, while far fewer principals of both elementary and high schools reported its use.

Major shifts in who administers corporal punisament were also noted: an increase of almost 200% in the number of principals who assume this responsibility. Unfortunately, there is a trend toward allowing the referring teacher to administer corporal punishment,

increase of over 500%). The referring teacher is also much more likely to serve as a witness than previously reported (a 174% increase). A 29.3% increase in the principals who use their offices as the location for administering corporal punishment was noted, but so was a disturbing trend toward allowing corporal punishment in relatively public places, such as hallways (a 200% increase).

A positive trend may be noted in Table 5, because 48% fewer principals reported using corporal punishment as a consequence for fighting. However, 190% more reported using corporal punishment for disobedience and the percentage of principals using it as a consequence for a wide range of typically ill-defined behaviors grouped in the miscellaneous category has more than tripled (a 371% increase).

The reader may find a relatively disturbing trend in the data presented in Table 5. Fewer principals are reporting shorter delays between the occurrence of the misbehavior and the administration of corporal punishment (23% fewer reported delays of less than 5 minutes), while almost 20% more principals reported delaying more than 20 minutes.

Finally, only two types of corporal punishment were reported in the current study: spanking with a paddle and spanking with the hand. No principals reported paddling students with other instruments (e.g., rulers or books) or corporal punishment that did not involve spanking (e.g., pinching or hair pulling), whereas 2.5%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of corporal punishment five years ago.

Apparently, principals are losing faith in corporal punishment, although many continue to use it. As may be seen in Table 5, far fewer principals thought that their using corporal punishment maintained the general level of discipline, maintained teacher morale, or demonstrated their support for their teachers. Unfortunately, fewer principals who used corporal punishment think that it has a reductive behavior on the targeted behavior.

The reader should be aware of several limitations of the present study before further conclusions are drawn. First, in order to ensure prompt and complete responses by the principals, relatively few items were included in the survey instrument. Some of these items may have restricted the range of answers that were possible because respondents were forced to choose an answer from a preselected array of answers. Second, there was no follow-up with principals who did not respond within the requested time period, which resulted in variable response rates across regions and a lack of information about those respondents who did not respond vis-a-vis those who did. Third, questions regarding the generalizability of the present findings are related to the adequacy of the sample size. Fourth, self-report data may tend to understate those data that the respondent views as having potentially negative implications. Fifth, the findings indicating an absence of corporal punishment in the New England region and that 100% of the principals in the West South Central region used

corporal punishment [illegible] may not generalize to other nonsampled schools in these regions. Although there are apparently no other published data to contradict the findings of the current study, the reader should be aware of the potential limitations of these two regions' data.

Despite its limitations, this study presents current documentation of the uses of corporal punishment with students in public school settings in the United States. Consequently, several tentative conclusions may be drawn regarding its use that are data-based rather than conjectural.

Guidelines for the effective use of punishment were identified by Azrin and Holz (1966), including: (a) the prevention of unauthorized escape from the punishing situation; (b) presentation of the punishing stimulus at maximum intensity; (c) consistent application; and (d) immediate application. Although these guidelines were derived from laboratory studies with subhuman species, they have been routinely generalized to humans because, in large part, of the paucity of empirically derived information available regarding the use of punishment, especially physical punishment, with humans. The findings of the current study address only the latter two guidelines. The requirement for consistent applications (i.e., everytime the target behavior occurs, the student receives corporal punishment) appears to continue to be unfulfilled because of the wide variability in and vague descriptions of many of the behaviors that were identified as earning corporal punishment. For example, behaviors such as

the specific emission of the behavior may be "the straw that broke the camel's back", rather than the first occurrence of that behavior. We may also infer that a variety of specific responses may be subsumed under these behavioral labels, so that clear knowledge of the rules by the child may be difficult. Also, teachers may have a great deal of latitude regarding specific behaviors that may be subsumed within these behavioral labels.

The requirment for immediate application seems to continue to be rarely met in public schools. At least two findings support this conclusion. One, the location in which corporal punishment is delivered is rarely the location in which the misbehavior occurred. There is an inherent delay as the student moves from one location to another. Two, delays of more than five minutes are typical in almost 81% of the schools (an increase of 6.3% over the last five years) and as long as 20 minutes or more are routine in almost 21% of the schools (an increase of 22.5%).

Administrative/procedural results allow other tentative conclusions regarding the uses of corporal punishment. First, we may infer that corporal punishment continues to be delivered typically by an individual who is not angry at the time, because principals or other administrative personnel are the individuals who primarily assume this responsibility. If this conclusion is accurate, it may imply a reduced risk for abuse. However, this conclusion may be considered more tenuous than when originally drawn five years ago, because of a significant increase in the

number of respondents who [illegible] the teaching teacher to deliver corporal punishment. This trend bears watching. Second, corporal punishment occurs most often in administrative areas, such as the principal's office, which implies a requirement of privacy. Even though the relative effects of public and private punishment are currently unkown, we may infer that privacy may preclude several undesired side effects, such as the misbehaving student receiving reinforcement via peer attention or being so humiliated by the experience that he or she would generalize the aversiveness to the total school situation. Of course, attributing these counterproductive effects differentially to public and private punishing situations is only conjectural. Nevertheless, we should be encouraged to find most principals still respecting their students' right to privacy. On the other hand, we should perhaps be alerted to a pronounced trend toward allowing corporal punishment to be delivered in public, such as hallways. Even though the absolute percentage of principals allowing this to occur in their schools remains small (7.5%), this represents three times more principals allowing this than five years ago.

Several findings, drawn from both demographic and administrative opinion results, continue to lead to disturbing conclusions regarding the use of corporal punishment as a behavior management technique. Punishment has been defined, in part, as a procedure in which an aversive stimulus is presented following a behavior, resulting in a reduction in the rate of that behavior (Rusch, Rose, & Greenwood, 1988). Currently, 26.1% of the

principals in the state of [illegible] punishment also reported they did not think that corporal punishment was effective in reducing specific behaviors emitted by specific students (an increase of 119% from 5 years ago). A continuing important question, then, refers to the continued use of a management procedure that is perceived as being ineffective for its primary purpose.

Second, corporal punishment continues to be used less often and with fewer female students. The accumulation of these data allow one to conclude that principals view corporal punishment as a sex-specific technique (i.e., it is appropriate and effective for boys and inappropriate and ineffective for girls). This author remains unaware of any evidence to support this differential application of corporal punishment, yet it quite obviously occurs. Other explanations remain plausible, (e.g., that female students do not emit the behaviors leading to corporal punishment as frequently as do male students). Regardless of the reasons for the differential use of corporal punishment with male and female students, one is left to wonder at the paradox that principals identify a behavior management technique they clearly think is effective and make an a priori decision to use it for only half of their students.

Finally, it appears that a majority of the public school principals in virtually every demographic situation in the United States use corporal punishment as a behavior management technique, even though fewer principals reported using corporal punishment

than in the past. Although the author wants to avoid taking a position as to its appropriateness, its widespread use should concern educators and researchers. The source of this concern continues to be the unsubstantiated effects of its use, rather than the use of corporal punishment per se. As discussed previously, there continues to be virtually no empirical evidence that either supports or refutes its use. An yet, over 58% of the principals reported using corporal punishment. The use of any instructional, administrative, or behavioral management procedure in the absence of any evidence that it is efective for its primary purpose should be cause for concern. Its use in a majority of schools should increase this concern.

The findings presented in this paper, both regarding the current uses of corporal punishment and the comparisons to the previous replicated study, indicate a need for systematic investigations of the various paramenters of corporal punishment. Because the current data can only be used to describe some of the uses and procedures surrounding the use of corporal punishment, functional relationships between variables cannot be explained. Consequently, a large number of experimental questions remain unanswered. First, the effectiveness of corporal punishment as a management technique remains to be documented. If it is found to be ineffective for its stated purpose, the reduction of inappropriate behaviors, then reasons for its continued use deserve experimental interest. For example, Rose (1984) found that a large majority of principals reported using corporal punishment for a

variety of managerial factors, such as demonstrating support for teachers and improving teachers' morale. Data from the current study support these findings. It has also been suggested that corporal punishment is maintained in the schools as a function of various reinforcing events (both positive and negative) that are unrelated to its direct effect on students' behavior (Rose, 1981). Alternative explanations may also be found to be feasible. If, on the other hand, corporal punishment is found to be effective, then questions relating to any differential effects (e.g., across age, race, SES, sex of student, or handicapping condition) remain to be investigated. A second area of investigation may focus on both short- and long-term side effects of corporal punishment, such as subsequent ajudication (e.g., Agnew, 1983; Welsh, 1978), damage to self-concept and subsequent social interactions (e.g., Bryan & Freed, 1982), or any generalization of the aversive stimuli (i.e.,corporal punishment) to include the broader setting in which the aversive stimuli are presented (i.e., school).

We must be realistic, however. The probabilities of experimental investigations of variables whose systematic manipulation would greatly expand our understanding of the effects of corporal punishment (e.g., differential delays) will remain low for the forseeable future due to a variety of societal restraints. Yet, the current data document the widespread use of corporal punishment and, by comparing with previous compatible findings, detect an increasing trend in its use. Our dilemma remains to reconcile the extensive use of a management procedure whose

short-term and long-term effects (and side effects) are unknown with an equally widespread hesitancy to investigate those effects. Until these issues are resolved, its use with students should either be avoided or, at least, be considered experimental, with appropriate human subjects safeguards routinely required, just as with any other unproven technique. The safeguards necessary to lessen the risk of corporal punishment being inflicted arbitrarily or excessively should include at least (a) informed consent from the student and the parents or guardians (Carr & Lovass, 1983; Griffith, 1983); (b) proper training for instructional and administrative personnel and provisions for their supervision (Wood & Braaten, 1983); and (c) the establishment of a careful review process (Griffith & Henning, 1981; Favell, et al., 1982).

A variety of implications for instructional personnel may be inferred. Gaylord-Ross (1980) outlined an instructionally relevant decision-making model that is consistent with the concept of using the least restrictive procedures and that the current data appear to support. This five step model requires instructional personnel to: (a) determine the severity of the behavior and its potential for harm, either to the individual student or others; (b) determine the reinforcers that are maintaining the misbehavior; (c) investigate the effects of any ecological stimuli (e.g., crowding or noise level in the classroom); (d) investigate the effects of curricular variables or instructional procedures; and (e) making a decision to implement punishment, if the investigations for steps a-d prove to be negative. At this point, a teacher should be able

to document that less aversive procedures have been ineffective and that the use of any aversive procedure is to be used to reduce a seriously maladaptive behavior; not as a retribution or revenge for some rather minor misbehavior.

Given that corporal punishment does occur, then requiring teachers to document the effectiveness of corporal punishment for each student is of the utmost importance. If the contingent use of corporal punishment yields long-term reductions of specific disruptive behaviors, then corporal punishment may be considered effective for <u>that</u> particular student. If the reduction is only temporary, however, then corporal punishment should be discontinued immediately in favor of reductive techniques whose efficacy have been demonstrated, such as differential reinforcement of other behaviors or differential reinforcement of low rates (see Matson & DiLorenzo, 1984 or Rusch, et al., 1988).

Footnotes

[1] At the time of the current study, corporal punishment was legally prohibited in only four states: New Jersey, Maine, Massachusetts, and Hawaii. However, the law in Maine, while excluding corporal punishment, allows force to be used to control a disturbance. Maryland, on the other hand, eliminated the use of corporal punishment on a statewide basis, but allows "home rule" that has resulted in only three counties prohibiting corporal punishment (Department of Education Office of Civil Rights, 1982; Hess, 1985). Currently, however, 11 states have enacted legislation prohibiting corporal punishment, including those listed above and New Hampshire, Rhode Island, New York, California, Vermont, Wisconsin, and Nebraska. A few other states (e.g., Illinois and Pennsylvania) offer parents the option to refuse corporal punishment.

[2] In an attempt to verify the validity of the male-female ratio of principals who responded to the present survey, an informal survey of the principals listed in Pattersons' American Education (1984) was conducted. Principals were selected randomly from the 18 states used in the original survey. Principals were included or excluded on the basis of three criteria: (a) they were not part of the original sample; (b) they were principals of public, nonspecialized schools; and (c) their sex could be discriminated on the basis of their name. A total of 1,700 principals were included from 1,294 school districts. Of those principals, 1,539 (90.5%) were male. Therefore, the male-female ratio reported in the present study appears to be a valid representation of the relevant population.

References

Agnew, R. (1983). Physical punishment and delinquency: A research note. Youth & Society, 15, 225-236.

Azrin, N.H., Hake, D.G., Holz, W.C., & Hutchinson, R.R. (1965). Motivational aspects of escape from punishment. Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior, 8, 31-44.

Azrin, N.H., Hake, D.G., & Hutchinson, R.R. (1965). Elicitation of aggression by a physical blow. Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior, 8, 55-57.

Azrin, N.H., & Holz, W.C. (1966). Punishment. In W.A. Honig (Ed.), Operant behavior: Areas of research and application (pp. 380-447). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Azrin, N.H., Hutchinson, R.R., & Sallery, R.D. (1964). Pain-aggression toward inanimate objects. Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior, 7, 223-228.

Bandura, A. (1965). Behavior modification through modeling procedures. In L. Krasner & L.P. Ullman (Eds.), Research in behavior modification (pp. 310-340). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Birnbrauer, J.S. (1968). Generalization of punishment effects: A case study. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1, 200-211.

Bolmeier, E.C. (1976). Legality of student disciplinary practices. Charlottesville, VA: Michie.

Bongiovanni, A.F. (1979). An analysis of research on punishment and its relation to the use of corporal punishment in the schools. In I.A. Hyman & J.H. Wise (Eds.), Corporal punishment in American public education (pp. 351-372). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Bongiovanni, A.F., & Hyman, I.A. (1978). Leviton is wrong on the use of corporal punishment. Psychology in the Schools, 15, 290-291.

Bryan, J.W., & Freed, F.W. (1982). Corporal punishment: Normative data and sociological and psychological correlates in a community college population. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 11, 77-87.

Carr, E.G., & Lovaas, I.O. (1983). Contingent electric shock as a treatment for severe behavior problems. In S. Axelrod & J. Apsche (Eds.), The effects of punishment on human behavior (pp. 221-245). New York: Academic Press.

Cooper, J.O., Heron, T.E., & Heward, W.L. (1987). Applied behavior analysis. Columbus, OH: Charles Merrill.

Delgado, J.M.R. (1963). Cerebral heterostimulation in a monkey colony. Science, 141, 161-163.

Dubanoski, R.A., Inaba, M., & Gerkewicz, K. (1983). Corporal punishment in schools: Myths, problems, and alternatives. Child Abuse & Neglect, 7, 271-278.

Elrod, W. (1983). Discipline and corporal punishment in Indiana public schools. Contemporary Education, 54, 141-144.

Favell, J.E., Azrin, N.H., Baumeister, A.A., Carr, E.G., Dorsey, M.F., Forehand, R., Foxx, R.M., Lovaas, I.O., Rincover, A., Risley, T.R., Romanczyk, R.G., Russo, D.C., Schroeder, S.R., & Solnick, J.V. (1982). The treatment of self-injurious behavior. Behavior Therapy, 13, 529-554.

Freeman, C.B. (1966). The Children's Petition of 1669 and its sequel. British Journal of Educational Studies, 14, 216-223.

Gardner, W.I. (1969). Use of punishment procedures with the severely retarded: A review. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 74, 86-103.

Gaylord-Ross, R. (1980). A decision model for the treatment of aberrant behavior in applied settings. In W. Sailor, B. Wilcox, & L Brown (Eds.), Methods of instruction for severely handicapped students (pp. 135-158). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Glackman, T., Martin, E., Hyman, I., McDowell, E., Berv, V., & Spino, P. (1978). Corporal punishment, school suspensions, and the civil rights of students: An analysis of the Office of Civil Rights surveys. Inequality in Education, 23, 61-65.

Griffith, R.G. (1983). The administrative issues: An ethical and legal perspective. In S. Axelrod & J. Apsche (Eds.), The effects of punishment on human behavior (pp.317-338). New York: Academic Press.

Griffith, R.G., & Henning, D.B. (1981). What is a human rights committee? Mental Retardation, 19, 61-63.

Hess, F. (1985). Corporal punishment in American schools: A review of the issues. Spectrum, 3 (4), 19-29.

Hyman, I.A. (1976). A bicentennial consideration of the advent of child advocacy. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 5 (3), 15-20.

Ingraham v. Wright, 430 U.S. 651 (1977).

Johnston, J.M. (1972). Punishment of human behavior. American Psychologist, 27, 1033-1054.

Killory, J.F. (1974). In defense of corporal punishment. Psychological Reports, 35, 575-581.

Kinnard, K.Q. & Rust, J.O. (1981). Corporal punishment in Tennessee schools. Tennessee Education, 11 (2), 11-17.

Koegel, R.L., & Covert, A. (1972). The relationship of self-stimulation to learning in autistic children. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 5, 381-387.

Koegel, R.L., Firestone, P.B., Kramme, K.W., & Dunlap, G. (1974). Increasing spontaneous play by suppressing self-stimulation in autistic children. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 7, 521-528.

Leviton, H.S. (1976). The individualization of discipline for behavior disordered pupils. Psychology in the Schools, 13, 445-448.

Lovaas, O.I., Berberich, J.P., Perloff, B.F., & Schaeffer, B. (1966). Acquisition of imitative speech by schizophrenic children. Science, 151, 705-707.

Manning, J. (1979). Discipline in the good old days. In I.A. Hyman & J.H. Wise (Eds.), Corporal punishment in American public education (pp. 50-61). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Matson, J.L., & DiLorenzo, T.M. (1984). Punishment and its alternatives: A new perspective for behavior modification. New York: Springer Publishing Co.

Maurer, A. (1974). Corporal punishment. American Psychologist, 29, 614-626.

Maurer, A. (1982). Religious values and child abuse. Child and Youth Services, 4, 57-63.

Mercurio, J.A. (1972). Caning: An educational ritual. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 10, 49-53.

Owens, D.J., & Straus, M.A. (1975). The social structure of violence in childhood and approval of violence as an adult. Aggressive Behavior, 1, 193-211.

Patterson's American Education (1984). Mt. Prospect, IL: Educational Directories, Inc.

Raichle, D.R. (1977-78). School discipline and corporal punishment: An American retrospect. Interchange, 8, 71-83.

Reinholz, L.K. (1979). A practical defense of corporal punishment in the schools. In I.A. Hyman & J.H. Wise (Eds.), Corporal punishment in American public education (pp. 342-348). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Reitman, A. (1979). Corporal punishment in the schools: The civil liberties objections. In I.A. Hyman & J.H. Wise (Eds.), Corporal punishment in American public education (pp. 196-206). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Risley, T.R. (1968). The effects and side-effects of punishing the autistic behaviors of a deviant child. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1, 21-24.

Romanczyk, R.G. (1977). Intermittent punishment of self-stimulation: Effectiveness during application and extinction. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 53-60.

Rose, T.L. (1981). The corporal punishment cycle: A behavioral analysis of the maintenance of corporal punishment in the schools. Education and Treatment of Children, 4, 157-169.

Rose, T.L. (1983). A survey of corporal punishment of mildly handicapped students. Exceptional Education Quarterly, 3 (4), 9-19.

Rose, T.L. (1984). Current uses of corporal punishment in American public schools. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 427-441.

Rusch, F.R., Rose, T.L., & Greenwood, C.R. (1988). An introduction to behavior analysis in special education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Rust, J.O., & Kinnard, K.Q. (1983). Personality characteristics of the users of corporal punishment in the schools. Journal of School Psychology, 21, 91-98.

Skinner, B.F. (1973). Corporal punishment. In J.A. Hyman & J.H. Wise (Eds.), Corporal punishment in American public education (pp. 335-336). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Solomon, R.L. (1964). Punishment. American Psychologist, 19, 239-253.

Ulrich, R.E., & Azrin, N.H. (1962). Reflexive fighting in response to aversive stimulation. Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior, 5, 511-520.

Van Dyke, H.T. (1984). Corporal punishment in our schools. Clearing House, 57, 296-300.

Walters, G.C., & Grusec, J.E. (1977). Punishment. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.

Welsh, R. (1978). Delinquency, corporal punishment, and the schools. Crime and Delinquency, 24, 336-354.

Williams, G.J. (1973). Social sanctions for violence against children: Historical perspectives. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 5 (3), 2-11.

Wood, F.H., & Braaten, S. (1983). Developing guidelines for the use of punishing interventions in the schools. Exceptional Education Quarterly, 3 (4), 68-75.

Table 1

Quantitative Description of Respondents by Geographic Region

Region	No. in Pool	Responding from pool n	%	Sex Male	Female	School Level Elem.	Jr. High	High
Northeast (ME,NH,VT,CN,RI,MA)	22	15	68.2	12	3	8	2	4
Middle Atlantic (NY,NJ,PA)	32	24	75.0	19	5	11	4	7
East North Central (OH,IN,IL,MI,WI)	49	36	73.5	29	7	19	6	9
West North Central (MN,IA,MO,ND,SD,NB, KS)	41	26	63.4	21	5	13	4	8
South Atlantic (DE,MD,DC,VA,WV,NC, SC,GA,FL)	58	49	84.5	40	9	25	8	13
East South Central (KY,TN,AL,MS)	47	29	61.7	24	5	15	5	8
West South Central (AR,LA,OK,TX)	33	18	54.5	15	3	9	3	5

Table 1 (continued)

Region	No. in Pool	Responding from pool n	%	Sex Male	Female	School Level Elem.	Jr. High	High
Mountain (MT,ID,WY,CO,NM,AZ, UT,NV)	46	29	63.0	24	5	15	5	7
Pacific (WA,OR,CA,AK,HI)	43	35	81.4	29	5	18	6	10
Total	371	261	70.4	213	47	133	43	71

Table 2

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Questionnaire Items

Item	Frequency	%
Demographic		
Community Size:		
Rural, unincorporate	20	7.7
Incorporated, under 1,000	13	5.0
1,000-5,000	36	13.9
5,000-10,000	50	19.3
10,000-50,000	44	17.0
50,000-100,000	40	15.4
100,000-500,000	41	15.8
500,000 or more	51	5.8
Number of Students Enrolled:		
300 or fewer	37	14.2
301-600	124	47.5
601-900	52	19.9
901-1,200	21	8.0
1,201 or more	27	10.3

Table 2 Continued

Item	Frequency	%
Number of Years Experience as Principal:		
First year	14	5.5
2 - 5 years	48	18.9
6 - 10 years	68	26.8
11 - 15 years	42	16.5
16 - 20 years	46	18.1
21 - 25 years	22	8.7
26 or more years	14	5.5
Grade-level of Your School:		
Elementary (K-5 or K-6)	133	51.0
Junior High or Middle	43	16.5
High School	71	27.2
Discipline		
Is corporal punishment used in your school?		
Yes	151	58.1
No	109	41.9
Who administers?		
Principal	87	58.0
Referring Teacher	35	23.3
Other Administrators (e.g., Ass't Principal)	20	13.3
Other Teacher	6	4.0

Table 2 Continued

Item	Frequency	%
Witness must be present?		
Yes	146	97.3
No	4	2.7
Who may witness?		
Referring Teacher	56	38.1
Other Teacher	38	25.1
Principal	22	15.0
Other Administrators	14	9.5
Office Staff	14	9.5
Where does corporal punishment occur?		
Principal's Office	105	71.9
Other Administrative Area (e.g., Ass't Principal's or Counselor's Office)	17	11.6
Either Administrative Area	12	8.2
Hallways	11	7.5
Classroom Where Misbehavior Occurred	1	0.7
Delay between misbehavior and administration?		
One minute	2	1.3
1 - 5 minutes	27	18.0
6 - 10 minutes	37	24.7
11 - 15 minutes	30	20.0
16 - 20 minutes	23	15.3
more than 20 minutes	31	20.7

Table 2 Continued

Item	Frequency	%
What types of corporal punishment are used?		
Spanking with paddle	148	98.0
Spanking with hand	3	2.0
For the following three items, circle the number of students in each category who received corporal punishment in the last month		
Male:		
none	24	17.8
1 - 5	73	54.1
6 - 10	21	15.6
11 - 15	12	8.9
16 - 20	3	2.2
21 - 25	2	1.5
26 or more	0	---
Female:		
none	81	59.1
1 - 5	47	34.3
6 - 10	9	6.6
11 - 15	0	---
16 - 20	0	---
21 - 25	0	---
26 or more	0	---

Table 2 Continued

Item	Frequency	%
Black:		
none	65	48.5
1 - 5	57	42.5
6 - 10	6	4.5
11 - 15	0	---
16 - 20	0	---
21 - 25	3	2.2
26 or more	3	2.2
Do you keep administrative records regarding corporal punishment?		
Yes	150	98.0
No	3	2.0
Do you think that corporal punishment is effective in:		
Maintainin general level of discipline?		
Yes	97	59.1
No	67	40.9
Reducing specific behavior problems?		
Yes	122	73.9
No	43	26.1
Maintaining teacher morale?		
Yes	92	61.3
No	58	38.7

Table 2 Continued

Item	Frequency	%
Demonstrating your support of teachers?		
Yes	92	62.2
No	56	37.8
List the offense that most often leads to corporal punishment (categorized subsequent to responses).		
Fighting	40	27.6
Disruptive in classroom	28	19.3
Disrepect for authority	27	18.6
Disobedience	22	15.2
Truancy	9	6.2
Miscellaneous misdeeds	19	13.2

* Some categories total more or less than 100% due to rounding.

Table 3

Quantitative Description of Responses

Variable	Percent Responding Yes	No
Principal's Sex		
Male	56.3	43.7
Female	65.2	34.8
Community Size		
Rural	85.0	15.0
Under 1,000	76.9	23.1
1,000-5,000	91.7	8.3
5,000-10,000	53.1	46.9
10,000-50,000	43.2	56.8
50,000-100,000	42.5	57.5
100,000-500,000	51.2	48.8
500,000 or more	40.0	60.0
School Size		
Less than 300	62.2	37.8
301-600	58.9	41.1
601-900	74.5	25.5
901-1200	52.4	47.6
More than 1200	22.2	77.8
Grade Level		
Elementary (K-5 or 6)	61.7	38.3
Junior High/Middle	83.3	16.7
High School	28.2	71.8

Table 3 (continued)

Variable	Percent Responding Yes	No
Region		
New England	0	100
Middle Atlantic	29.2	70.8
East North Central	58.3	41.7
West North Central	56.0	44.0
South Atlantic	91.8	8.2
East South Central	89.7	10.3
West South Central	100	0
Mountain	28.6	71.4
Pacific	34.3	65.7
Principal's Experience		
First year	71.4	28.6
2-5 Years	59.6	40.4
6-10 years	63.2	36.8
11-15 years	47.6	52.4
16-20 years	65.2	34.8
21-25 years	68.2	31.8
More than 26 years	21.4	78.6

Table 4

Frequency of Implementation per Month

Variable	Number of times corporal punishment was used during past month						
	0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26+
	Percent of principals reporting use with male students						
Principal's Sex							
Male	21.4	51.8	13.4	9.8	2.7	0.9	0
Female	0	68.2	27.3	0	0	4.5	0
Number of Students							
300 or fewer	19.0	52.4	14.3	14.3	0	0	0
301-600	11.9	62.7	13.4	9.0	0	3.0	0
601-900	19.4	47.2	25.0	0	8.3	0	0
901-1,200	45.5	27.3	0	27.3	0	0	0
1,200 or more	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Percent of principals reporting use with female students						
Principal's Sex							
Male	60.9	32.2	7.0	0	0	0	0
Female	52.4	47.6	0	0	0	0	0

Table 4 (continued)

Variable	Number of times corporal punishment was used during past month						
	0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26+
Number of Students							
300 or fewer	61.9	38.1	0	0	0	0	0
301-600	62.1	33.3	4.5	0	0	0	0
601-900	52.8	30.6	16.7	0	0	0	0
901-1,200	45.5	54.5	0	0	0	0	0
1,200 or more	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Percent of principals reporting use with black students						
Principal's Sex							
Male	42.0	48.2	5.4	0	0	1.8	2.7
Female	85.7	14.3	0	0	0	0	0
Number of Students							
300 or fewer	47.6	38.1	14.3	0	0	0	0
301-600	42.1	53.0	0	0	0	4.5	0
601-900	52.8	30.6	8.3	0	0	0	8.3
901-1,200	72.7	27.3	0	0	0	0	0
1,200 or more	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 5

Trends in Uses of Corporal Punishment

Item	Percent Responding Yes 1984	Current	Percent Change
Corporal punishment used in your school?	74.1	58.1	- 25.6
Community Size			
Rural	85.7	85.0	- 0.8
Under 1,000	100	76.9	- 23.1
1,000-5,000	94.4	91.7	- 1.1
5,000-10,000	61.3	53.1	- 13.4
10,000-50,000	64.7	43.2	- 33.2
50,000-100,000	80.0	42.5	- 46.9
100,000-500,000	52.3	51.2	- 2.1
500,000 or more	100	40.0	- 60.0
Principal's Sex			
Male principals	70.0	56.3	- 19.6
Female principals	100	65.2	- 34.8

Table 3 (continued)

Item	Percent Responding Yes 1984	Current	Percent Change
Region			
New England	0	0	---
Middle Atlantic	25.0	29.2	+ 16.8
East North Central	80.0	58.3	- 27.1
West North Central	71.4	55.0	- 21.6
South Atlantic	87.5	91.8	+ 4.9
East South Central	100	89.7	- 10.3
West South Central	100	100	---
Mountain	64.3	28.6	- 55.5
Pacific	65.0	34.3	- 47.2
Number of Students			
300 or fewer	88.3	62.2	- 30.0
301-600	72.3	58.9	- 19.2
601-900	71.9	74.5	+ 3.6
901-1,200	81.0	52.4	- 35.3
1,200 or more	50.0	22.2	- 55.6
Grade Level			
Elementary	83.7	61.7	- 26.3
Junior High	72.4	83.3	+ 15.1
High School	55.2	28.2	- 48.9

Table 5 (continued)

Item	Percent Responding Yes 1984	Current	Percent Change
Who administers?			
Referring Teacher	3.7	23.3	+ 530.0
Principal	21.0	58.0	+ 176.2
Other Administrators	9.9	13.3	+ 34.3
Witness must be present?	97.5	97.3	- 0.2
Who may witness?			
Referring Teacher	13.9	38.1	+ 174.1
Other Teacher	13.9	25.9	+ 86.3
Principal	0	15.0	---
Other Administrators	2.5	9.5	+ 280.0
Office Staff	7.6	9.5	+ 25.0
Where administered?			
Principal's Office	55.6	71.9	+ 29.3
Other Administrate Area	11.7	11.6	---
Hallways	2.5	7.5	+ 200.0
Classroom Where Misbehavior Occurred	1.2	0.7	- 41.7

Table 5 (continued)

Item	Percent Responding Yes 1984	Current	Percent Change
Delay between misbehavior and administration?			
One minute	---	1.3	---
1 - 5 minutes	21.1	18.0	- 25.3
6 - 10 minutes	24.1	24.7	+ 2.5
11 - 15 minutes	24.1	20.0	- 16.7
16 - 20 minutes	10.8	15.3	+ 41.7
More than 20 minutes	16.9	20.7	+ 22.5
Behaviors leading to corporal punishment?			
Fighting	51.4	27.6	- 46.3
Disruptive in classroom	21.4	19.3	- 9.8
Disobedience	6.4	18.6	+ 190.6
Disrespect for authority	13.5	15.2	+ 12.6
Truancy	4.3	6.2	+ 44.2
Miscellaneous misdeeds	2.8	13.2	+ 371.4
How administered?			
Spank with paddle	91.1	98.0	+ 7.2
Spank with hand	1.2	2.0	+ 66.7
Spank with other instruments	2.5	0	- 100.0
Non-spanking	4.9	0	- 100.0

Table 5 (continued)

Item	Percent Responding Yes 1984	Current	Percent Change
Is corporal punishment effective in:			
Maintaining general level of discipline?	83.3	59.1	- 29.1
Reducing specific behavior problems for specific students?	88.1	73.9	- 16.1
Maintaining teacher morale?	73.0	61.3	- 16.0
Demonstrating your support of your teachers?	73.1	62.2	- 14.9